

Minutes
Catawba County Board of Commissioners
Regular Session, Monday, September 18, 2006, 7:00 p.m.

Appointments

Alcohol Beverage Control Board	397	09/18/06
Sister Cities Association Board	397	09/18/06
NC Auditorium Authority Board of Directors	397	09/18/06
Juvenile Crime Prevention Council	397	09/18/06

E-News

Newsletter	396	09/18/06
------------	-----	----------

Incentives

Resolutions for Flowers Foods and Baker Furniture	397	09/18/06
---	-----	----------

Interbasin Transfer

Support of Opposition Efforts	397	09/18/06
-------------------------------	-----	----------

Ordinances

Proposed Unified Development Ordinance Public Hearing	387	09/18/06
Financing of an Industrial Project	385	09/18/06

Personnel

Reinventing Government – Social Services	397	09/18/06
--	-----	----------

Planning

Public hearing on proposed Unified Development Ordinance	387	09/18/06
--	-----	----------

Presentations

Family Day Proclamation	384	09/18/06
-------------------------	-----	----------

Public Hearing

Proposed Unified Development Ordinance	387	09/18/06
Proposed New Official Zoning Maps based on Small Area Plans and Unified Development Ordinance	387	09/18/06
Financing of an Industrial Project	385	09/18/06
Proposed Schedule of Values, Standards and Rules for Revaluation	384	09/18/09

Reinventing

Personnel changes – Social Services	397	09/18/06
-------------------------------------	-----	----------

Resolutions

Financing of an Industrial Project	385	09/18/06
Flower Foods and Baker Incentives	397	09/18/06

Revaluation

Public Hearing	384	09/18/06
----------------	-----	----------

Social Services

Reinventing Government – Social Services	397	09/18/06
--	-----	----------

Tax

Revaluation Public Hearing	384	09/18/06
----------------------------	-----	----------

The Catawba County Board of Commissioners met in regular session on Monday, September 18, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. in the 1924 Courthouse, Robert E. Hibbitts Meeting Room, 30 North College Avenue, Newton, North Carolina.

Present were Chair Katherine W. Barnes, Vice-Chair Dan Hunsucker and Commissioners Glenn E. Barger, Lynn M. Lail and Barbara G. Beatty.

Also present were County Manager J. Thomas Lundy, Assistant County Manager Joellen Daley, Assistant County Manager Lee Worsley, Interim County Attorney Debra Bechtel, Attorney Anne Marie Pease and County Clerk Barbara Morris.

1. Chair Katherine W. Barnes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. Commissioner Glenn E. Barger led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.
3. Commissioner Barbara G. Beatty offered the invocation.
4. Commissioner Barger made a motion to approve the minutes from the Special Session of August 28, 2006, the Closed Session of August 28, 2006 and the Regular Meeting of September 5, 2006. The motion carried unanimously.
5. Recognition of Special Guests: Chair Barnes welcomed all those present and said it was good to see so many citizens attending the meeting. She also welcomed commissioner candidate Clem Geitner and reminded those present that she, Commissioner Barger and Commissioner Lail were also on the ballot for the upcoming election.
6. Comments for Items not on the Agenda.
Tracy Warlick came forward to voice his concern regarding sedimentation and erosion control enforcement. He provided the Board with copies of letters and documentation regarding violations he had been charged with. He stated he believed he had not received due process and had issues with how his violation was handled. The Board stated they would review the documents and discuss the issue with the staff and Mr. Warlick would receive a response to his complaint.

Gerald Bennett also came forward to voice his concern regarding 911 response time. Chair Barnes said his issue would be investigated and staff would contact him.

7. Presentations:
Commissioner Barger presented Public Health Director Doug Urland with a proclamation declaring Monday, September 25, 2006 as Family Day, A Day To Eat Dinner With Your Children in Catawba County. Surveys conducted by The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University have consistently found that the more often children and teenagers eat dinner with their families the less likely they are to smoke, drink and use illegal drugs. Studies conducted by respected researchers and institutions have found that children who eat dinner with their families are more likely to have healthier eating habits and less likely to be overweight or have eating disorders. Teenagers who virtually never eat dinner with their families are 72% more likely than the average teenager to use illegal drugs, alcohol and cigarettes, and teenagers who almost always eat dinner with their families are 31% less likely than the average teenager to use illegal drugs, alcohol and cigarettes. Parental influence is known to be one of the most crucial factors in helping children form lifestyle choices and in determining the likelihood of substance abuse by teenagers. Doug Urland urged citizens to participate in the Family Day Celebration taking place on September 25, 2006 at Southside Park from 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. (raindate 9/26).
8. Public Hearings:
 - a. Randy Moose, Tax Administrator, came forward to present the proposed Schedule of Values, Standards, and Rules that will be used for Catawba County's 2007 Revaluation and request the Board to conduct a public hearing. The County's next countywide revaluation will become effective on January 1, 2007.

North Carolina General Statue 105-386 mandates that all real property be reappraised at least every eight years. Many of North Carolina's 100 counties have moved to cycles of four or five years rather than eight.

The Board passed a resolution on August 18, 2003 to keep Catawba County on a four-year revaluation cycle first established in 1999. The Board cited the following reasons for advancing the revaluation cycle:

- It generally will help reduce the "sticker shock" for taxpayers from dramatic increases in values. Values are not apt to rise as rapidly in a four year cycle versus an eight year cycle.
- The level of assessment between personal property and real property remains more equitable with more frequent revaluations. Personal property is required by law to be appraised at 100% value every year; whereas real property is only at 100% on the year of revaluation. The more years that come between revaluations, the more distorted the values on record become, thereby creating an inequity of the tax burden among taxpayers.
- Public service companies receive an automatic reduction in the 4th and 7th years following the last revaluation if the level of assessment drops below 90% as determined by the North Carolina Department of Revenue. That level of assessment becomes the percent of value on which public service companies' tax bills are computed. Revaluation cycles of four years or less eliminate this loss. Catawba County's revenue loss for years 1995-1998 was \$2,285,253.89.
- A more accurate future tax base and tax rates can be forecast with a reduced period between revaluations.

North Carolina General Statute 105-317 sets forth the essential elements of a revaluation. Catawba County has approximately 84,000 separate parcels of land which must be individually appraised at 100% of market value by the effective date of January 1, 2007. The State has established "market value" as the standard by which all real property is to be assessed. Market value is defined by the State as "the price estimated in terms of money at which the property would change hands between a willing and financially able buyer and a willing seller, neither being under any compulsion to buy or to sell and both having reasonable knowledge of all the uses to which the property is adapted and for which it is capable of being used".

County staff had worked for many months researching and analyzing local property sales, building data, cost data and other information, culminating in the formulation of an appraisal manual, or as the General Statute describes it, a "uniform schedule of values, standards, and rules" to be used in appraising real property in the county. The schedule was formulated from three primary sources: 1) the local real estate market, 2) nationally developed data on the cost of building construction, adjusted to reflect local building costs, and 3) income and expense data from income producing properties in the county.

The Board of Commissioners held a work session to receive information on the 2007 revaluation process on August 21, 2006. On August 28, 2006 a Value Review Committee met to scrutinize the proposed Schedule of Values, Standards, and Rules. After an in-depth discussion with staff regarding formulation of the schedule, the committee offered its opinion that the schedule is legal, accurate and, when utilized properly, generates a fair estimate of market value for real property in Catawba County. Value Review Committee members attending included Mr. Charles Preston, Mr. Clement Geitner and Ms. Lynda DeHart.

Chair Barnes opened the public hearing, stating it had been duly advertised, and asked anyone to come forward who wished to speak on the Schedule of Values, Standards and Rules for the Catawba County 2007 Revaluation. Hearing and seeing no one, Chair Barnes closed the public hearing.

Chair Barnes noted that now that the public hearing had been conducted, the Board will consider formal adoption of the Schedule of Values at its meeting beginning at 9:30 a.m. on Monday, October 2, 2006, at the Robert E. Hibbitts Meeting Room of the 1924 Courthouse.

b. James Mitchell, Chair of the Catawba County Industrial Facilities and Pollution Control Financing Authority, came forward to present a request for the Board to conduct a public hearing to consider the financing of an industrial project and authorizing an application in industrial revenue bonds for Fiber-Line, Inc. The proposed project includes a 60,000 s.f. expansion of Fiber-Line's existing manufacturing facility located in Shurwood Business Park, 280 Performance Drive, S.E. in Hickory. The project also includes the acquisition of

equipment to be used in the manufacture of coated synthetic yarns, fiberglass yarns and various resin products.

Fiber-Line would add 25 new jobs increasing the employment from 33 to 58 over the next three (3) years. The average expected wage will be approximately \$14/hr. for machine operators and administrative personnel. Training programs offered through Catawba Valley Community College will be used to help offset training costs for the company.

The Catawba County Industrial Facilities and Pollution Control Financing Authority entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the Company on July 19, 2006.

This expansion would generate approximately \$44,550 in annual combined Hickory and Catawba County tax revenue.

A public hearing had been advertised to consider the financing of \$4,500,000 in Industrial Revenue Bonds for the Fiber-Line Inc. expansion project. The public hearing was advertised in the Hickory Daily Record on Wednesday, August 30, 2006. As with all IRB projects, there is no financial obligation to Catawba County or North Carolina. The money comes from private investors and the bonds are sold in national capital markets to insurance companies, bond and mutual funds.

Chair Barnes opened the public hearing, noting it had been duly advertised, and asked anyone who wished to speak to come forward. Hearing and seeing no one, Chair Barnes closed the public hearing. Commissioner Barger made a motion to adopt the following resolution. The motion carried unanimously.

Resolution No. _____

RESOLUTION APPROVING THE ISSUANCE BY THE CATAWBA COUNTY INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES AND POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING AUTHORITY OF NOT EXCEEDING \$4,500,000 AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF ITS QUALIFIED SMALL ISSUE INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS TO FINANCE AN INDUSTRIAL AND MANUFACTURING PROJECT IN CATAWBA COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA FOR FIBER-LINE, INC. AND HICKORY REAL ESTATE ASSOCIATES AND APPROVING SUCH PROJECT IN PRINCIPLE.

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners for the County of Catawba has created a political subdivision and body corporate and politic of the State of North Carolina known as "The Catawba County Industrial Facilities and Pollution Control Financing Authority" (the "*Authority*"); and

WHEREAS, the Authority is authorized under the Industrial and Pollution Control Facilities Financing Act, Chapter 159C of the General Statutes of North Carolina, as amended (the "*Act*"), to issue industrial revenue bonds for the purpose, among others, of paying all or any part of the cost of any industrial or pollution control project for industry; to acquire, construct, improve and equip any such project; and to make and execute financing agreements, security documents and other contracts and instruments necessary or convenient in the exercise of such powers; and

WHEREAS, the Authority has determined to issue not exceeding \$4,500,000 aggregate principal amount of its qualified small issue industrial revenue bonds to pay all or a portion of the costs of the Project to be located in Catawba County, North Carolina, to be owned and operated by the Borrowers, the interest on said bonds to be excludable from gross income of the owners thereof for purposes of federal income taxation by virtue of the provisions of Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, or any successor thereto; and

WHEREAS, the Authority intends to file an application for approval of the Project with the Secretary of the Department of Commerce (the "DOC"), as required by the Act; and

WHEREAS, the DOC has, by regulation, provided that no application for approval of a project will be officially received until the governing body of the County from which the application is made has, by resolution after having held a public hearing, approved the issue of revenue bonds and approved in principle the proposed project and a certified copy of such resolution has been provided to the DOC; and

WHEREAS, the Project will be located wholly within Catawba County; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners, pursuant to public notice duly given, has held a public hearing on the proposed qualified small issue industrial revenue bond issue and the Project and has considered the comments of persons who requested to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners desires to approve the issuance of the qualified small issue industrial revenue bonds and approve the Project in principle;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Commissioners for the County of Catawba:

(1) The issuance of qualified small issue industrial revenue bonds by the Authority in an aggregate principal amount not exceeding \$4,500,000 to finance the Project is hereby approved.

(2) The Project is hereby approved in principle.

(3) The Clerk of the Board of Commissioners is hereby authorized and directed to provide a certified copy of this resolution to the DOC.

(4) The Board of County Commissioners hereby requests that the State of North Carolina, pursuant to Chapter 588 of the 1987 North Carolina General Session Laws, or any other executive order or legislation relating to volume limitations on tax-exempt financing, allocate to the above-described qualified small issue industrial revenue bonds and Project \$4,500,000 of "unified volume limitation" (as described in said Session Laws or in any such other executive order or legislation), and acknowledges that any such allocation shall be only for purposes of said Project and that any portion of such allocation not utilized in connection with such bonds and Project or which terminates or expires as provided in said Session Laws will, without further action, revert to the State of North Carolina, and there is hereby approved the application by the Authority for such an allocation.

(5) This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage.

Commissioner Glenn Barger moved the passage of the foregoing resolution and the resolution was passed by the following vote:

AYES: Unanimous.

c. Chair Barnes then announced the next public hearing was regarding the proposed Unified Development Ordinance. She noted this would also include the advertised public hearing for the zoning maps. Jacky Eubanks, Planning Director, came forward to present the public hearing for the proposed Unified

Development Ordinance. He said he would conduct the presentation as it had been done before - as a joint presentation for both the text amendment and the zoning maps.

Jacky explained the reason for zoning and the proposed UDO. In order to maintain a high quality of life, it is important for the County to have land use regulations that balance individual desires with the desires of community residents and businesses. The existing ordinances that are being used to govern the County are in need of updating to reflect current trends. (The Subdivision Ordinance was last comprehensively updated in 1988, and the Zoning Ordinance was last comprehensively updated in 1990. Typically ordinances are updated every 10 to 15 years.) The UDO consolidates updated regulations related to subdivisions, zoning, manufactured home parks, junk cars and development standards into one user-friendly document. The UDO is the "tool box" of regulations, which enable the SAP goals and visions to be implemented.

In the mid 1990s, the County developed a new long-range comprehensive plan known as VisionQuest 2010. The plan was adopted by the Board of Commissioners in 1996 and served as the basis for future land-use decisions, such as rezoning requests, transportation needs, etc.

After VisionQuest 2010, the County developed a Strategic Growth Plan to address growth-related issues in the County. This plan was accepted by the Board of Commissioners in March 1999. One of 16 major strategies in the plan was to prepare small area plans for the County specific to 7 areas.

The County began the process of obtaining input on how the County should grow and develop through the small area planning process. The County was divided into 7 small area districts. Small Area Plan committee members, comprised of citizens living in the area, were appointed by the Board of Commissioners beginning in 1999. Committees included over 70 citizens with a broad range of experience, interests and background such as:

- a. Construction/development
- b. Real estate
- c. Agriculture
- d. Professional, and
- e. Municipal planners and managers

The committees developed specific recommendations for future growth and development of the County based on input from community meetings attended by over 500 citizens. Notification of these meetings included newspaper articles, web site notices, cable and radio announcements and hundreds of flyers posted in the community, including copies in church newsletters. Copies of the draft plans were in the County's libraries for review prior to public hearings. Those who attended the first community meeting received personal letters inviting them to the second public meeting to review the draft plan and to attend future public hearings. The Planning Board and Board of Commissioners' public hearings were advertised with four- ¼ page ads run in two local newspapers.

The Small Area Plan committees met monthly, for each of the 7 small areas, ranging from 14 months to over 3 years. Key issues identified by the public during the public meetings included:

- a. Preservation of rural character
- b. Higher development standards
- c. Enhanced visual corridors and entryways
- d. Stricter code enforcement program
- e. Open space preservation
- f. Density ranging from low to moderate based on available infrastructure

Upon acceptance of the small area plans by the Board of Commissioners, the next step was the implementation of the plan recommendations through the re-write of the County's zoning, subdivision and other land development codes in the form of a Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). The UDO provides higher development standards such as sidewalks, interior landscape islands, updated sign regulations, density bonuses, building design criteria for certain districts and village centers, etc.

In the fall of 2003, the County entered into a contract with Freilich, Leitner, and Carlisle to prepare a draft Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to be assisted by the planning staff and a Board appointed steering committee. Phase I of the project involved the preparation of a reconnaissance report which included over

220 interest statements from interviews conducted with stakeholders and citizens throughout the community in order to frame key issues and concerns surrounding land use matters.

The 10 stakeholder groups included:

- a. Catawba Valley Homebuilders Association
- b. Bar Association
- c. Board of Realtors
- d. Farm Bureau
- e. Chamber of Commerce
- f. Professionals in development including engineering and architects
- g. Duke Power
- h. Catawba County Historical Association
- i. Municipal government planners
- j. Habitat for Humanity

The reconnaissance report was submitted to the Planning Board and the Board of Commissioners in the spring of 2004. Phase II of the project involved the drafting of 8 articles to be included in the UDO and revisions to a procedures manual. The major drafting of the UDO was completed in May 2006. The draft document became available for public view on May 25, when it was posted on the County's web site and hard copies were placed in the local libraries.

A UDO steering committee was appointed by the BOC to assist the planning staff and the consultant in drafting the UDO. The Steering Committee recommended adoption of the UDO on May 23, subject to minor revisions and technical corrections. Committee members represented the following interest groups:

- a. Construction/development
- b. Real estate
- c. Agriculture
- d. Municipal
- e. Other professionals.

The following people were members:

Ed Nolley
Ed Neill
Anne Barrier
Jeff Kerley
Vance Dalton, Jr.
D. Paul Beatty
Paul Fleetwood
J.V. Huffman, Jr.
Trent Cloninger
Donna Cullum
Darrin Reid
Al King
Phillip M. Hayes
David Stewart

A series of public presentations of the draft UDO were conducted between June 1st and July 25th:

- a. Joint meetings (2 meetings) of the 7 SAP committees divided into east and west groupings
- b. Bar Association
- c. Surveyors Association
- d. Mobile Home Park Owners
- e. Mobile Home Park Dealers and State Association (NCMHA)
- f. Chamber of Commerce Land Use Committee (5 meetings)
- g. Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors
- h. Catawba County Homebuilders Association (held jointly with Chamber Board)
- i. Catawba Valley Association of Realtors (held jointly with Chamber Board)
- j. Chamber of Commerce SE Chapter Business After Hours meeting
- k. Churches within the County's jurisdiction

- l. Planning Board workshops (2 meetings)
- m. Public Forums (2 meetings) east and west
- n. Catawba Valley Landlords Association (meeting will be held on 9/12/06)

In addition to the public presentations the following public outreach and notification activities were conducted:

- a. A series of articles were published in the 4 area newspapers
- b. A television spot
- c. ¼ page newspaper ads (8 consecutive weeks in each of 3 local newspapers)
- d. Standard legal ads (10 – 25 days prior to the public hearings) (2 advertisements)
- e. Posting of rezoning signs at key entryways to the County (12 signs)
- f. Posting of UDO on the County web site with facts and questions brochure
- g. Placement of hard copies of the draft UDO in 8 area libraries including large scale zoning maps
- h. First class mailings to approximately 41,000 property owners notifying them of proposed rezoning actions, along with a question and answer insert and small scale map of the proposed zoning changes
- i. Drop-by sessions for questions and answers (4 sessions including day and evening hours to be held August 1 through August 7)
- j. Planning Board public hearing (1 meeting was held on August 7)
- k. Board of Commissioners public hearings (spread over 2 meetings to be held August 21 and September 18)

The following are highlights of key issues raised during the series of recently held public meetings:

Issues incorporated in the UDO (latest draft)

- a. Open space dedication for conventional and cluster subdivisions including credits and density bonuses
- b. Allow standing seam roofs on manufactured homes in addition to shingle roofs
- c. ATMs and drive through windows will be allowed in the MUC-O

Issues to be incorporated in the UDO (not in draft)

- a. Switchout of singlewides – The UDO steering committee and PB recommended allowing switchouts for all existing singlewides without requiring the owner prove “extenuating or hardship” circumstances.
- b. Hotels and motels allowed as a permitted use in the MUC-O consistent with RC, HC and O-I permitted uses.
- c. Businesses that are operating in a zoning district where that business is not permitted – non-permitted businesses would be allowed a 2-year period to come into conformance from the date of notification of violation and proof of business operations as of 1/1/06. (It is recommended that this requirement be embodied in an adopted BOC policy statement rather than as part of the UDO regulations. Conformance with the regulations mean that the business be able to comply with home occupation and/or cottage business regulations or to relocate the business in a commercial area.)
- d. Sidewalks – If sidewalks are added to the development as part of the requirement or optional to the developer on a voluntary basis, a 2 for 1 credit relating to open space requirements is granted. (For example for every 1 square foot of sidewalk construction, 2 square feet of open space are credited.)
- e. Campgrounds – The area requirement and the setbacks for the campgrounds allowed in the residential districts would be 5 acres with a 100-foot perimeter setback. A special use permit from the BOA would be required when campgrounds are in residential districts. The area and setback requirements match the requirements for campgrounds allowed in the commercial districts as a permitted use. The minimum space allowed for each tent cabin or vehicle space, in the residential and commercial districts, would be reduced from 3000 square feet to 1500 square feet with an additional 1500 square feet of space to be dedicated for active or passive recreation.
- f. Marinas – Allow retail sale of boats and campgrounds as permitted accessory uses. Where campgrounds are planned as part of a marina in a residential or commercial operation, a minimum of 7 acres is required.
- g. School capacity – After much discussion with developers, business owners and other citizens, it is staff’s recommendation that the school capacity restrictions be lifted in accordance with the recommendations or the small area plans as reflected on the official UDO zoning map.
- h. Subdivisions connecting to County utilities:
 - 1. Subdivisions up to 100 lots connecting to utilities:

New subdivisions up to 100 lots, which connect to utilities, have the option to apply for a planned development/conditional zoning in order to gain extra density than the UDO zoning map allows. (3. a – b) The County and the developer would agree to negotiate amenities such as those depicted below. (4. a – g)

2. Subdivisions at or above 101 lots connecting to utilities:

New subdivisions at or above 101 lots, which connect to utilities, are required to apply for a planned development/conditional zoning. The higher density as stipulated below (3. a – b) is granted to the developer where amenities are negotiated with the County as depicted below. (4. a – g)

3. Densities.

- (a) 2 units per acre for water line availability and/or
- (b) 3 units per acre for sewer availability or a combination of both utilities.

4. Amenities.

- (a) Open space above the minimum required in the UDO;
- (b) Trails and bicycle paths;
- (c) Conservation easements;
- (d) Road improvements above DOT minimum requirements;
- (e) Active and passive recreation and parks facilities;
- (f) Landscaping and buffering above the minimum standards required in the UDO; or
- (g) Traffic improvements, internal and external, to school sites, or other school improvements if impact fees or an adequate public facilities ordinance is not adopted.
- (i) Big box construction criteria:
 - 1. New construction equal to or exceeding 75,000 gross square feet of single plate ground floor as a stand-alone retail structure;
 - 2. A vacated building plan and an adaptive reuse plan should be incorporated as part of the original project approval; and
 - 3. Facades lengths greater than 100 feet must be articulated with recesses or projections, which total at least 25% of the facade length.

Issues where changes are not recommended

a. Approximately 50% of the land area in the County has been designated on the UDO zoning map for 2-acre minimum lots, as recommended in the SAPs. Reducing or eliminating the acreage earmarked for 2 acre minimum lot size requirement is not recommended except under the following situations.

- 1. Planned development containing multi-family; (in draft UDO)
- 2. Village centers; (in draft UDO)
- 3. Conditional zoning/development agreements; (in draft UDO)
- 4. Density bonuses in standard subdivisions, cluster subdivisions, planned developments and village centers in exchange for additional open space; (in draft UDO) and
- 5. Subdivisions connecting to County utilities (proposed under h 1-4 above).

b. Transfer of development rights (TDR). At this point it is unclear if Counties have the legal authority to implement TDRs. The same objective can be accomplished through the use of development agreements attached to conditional zoning.

c. Allowing singlewides throughout the County to help with affordable housing. One third of the County's housing is currently manufactured housing. As such, existing affordable housing is available.

d. The removal of manufacturing homes that have become uninhabitable and are vacated. Adopting a minimum housing code is not recommended at this time due to associated costs for removal. A change to the solid waste ordinance will help in this regard

e. Driveway construction standards for residential lots. Twenty-foot extension from ROW into the private property was not recommended due to cost.

The planning staff recommended the Planning Board's recommendation of UDO dated 7/28/06 including:

- 1. Items a -i above, under the heading "Items to be incorporated in the UDO (not in draft)
- 2. All applications which have not been recommended or approved by the PB, BOA, or SRB prior to the effective date of the UDO are subject to the new UDO regulations.
- 3. Technical and grammatical corrections prior to adoption by the BOC.

At the Planning Board Public Hearing a background was given on the SAP and the UDO planning process including that the SAP and UDO committees were made up of a cross-section of residents living in the areas who cumulatively worked on the SAPs for approximately 6 years. The public involvement process was also reviewed, explaining how the committees sought public involvement through announcements posted in the

area, inviting people to give their insight and inviting them to the open house planning sessions both at the beginning and toward end of the SAP process.

A PowerPoint presentation was given to explain main points of the UDO and address some common questions that were received during our special interest group presentations, public forums, drop-in sessions and telephone inquiries. Based on permits issued in the last 15 years, staff explained that limiting singlewides does not create a large impact in the County. Permits were issued for 392 singlewides in 1991. In 1994 the number of singlewide permits increased to 505. Since then singlewide permits have declined. In 2005 only 76 residents requested permits for singlewides. The number of permits for doublewides has also declined since 1999, with only 53 permits issued in 2005. Since 1996 the majority of permits have been for modular or stick-built homes.

Public comments at the Planning Board meeting included the following comments:

- Manufactured home (MH) switchouts for singlewides or doublewides should be allowed without having a hardship;
- Metal on metal MH should be allowed anywhere (note: appearance criteria was in effect since 1996);
- Concerns were brought up over traffic flow;
- Non-permitted businesses should be allowed to operate more than 2 years in order to form co-ops in which to operate;
- Two acre lots should not be required anywhere;
- Several people asked for clarification on specific UDO items, such as grandfathering of existing lots;
- An ordinance is hard to construct because it is impossible to please everyone since people have different opinions. Limiting manufactured homes is good for the County residents and the UDO is good to keep County a desirable place to live.

The Planning Board reiterated the SAP and UDO process and thousands of man-hours and deliberation that went into the creation of each of those documents. Board members explained that the process included balancing the desires of many people and groups who had different opinions and ideals, especially those opinions related to minimum lot sizes, manufactured home regulations and placement, and the extent to which business operations could be conducted on residential properties. The Board explained that this document reflects what the committees felt was best for the County at this time. Ordinances can change, through the public hearing process, to reflect changing situations, which occur over time. The Planning Board unanimously recommended that the Board of Commissioners adopt the UDO including the staff recommendations as stated above.

The Unified Development Ordinance establishes new zoning classifications for all properties in the County's planning jurisdiction. With the abolishment of the old zoning ordinance and its zoning classifications, the Board must adopt a new official zoning map. The new map will replace the old official zoning map in its entirety.

The zoning maps consist of "general" zoning and "overlay" zoning. The general zoning is the base zoning for each property. Every tract of land in the County's zoning jurisdiction will have a new general zoning district. The overlay zoning creates supplemental regulations for affected properties, which are additional regulations for areas such as watershed, floodplain, mixed-use corridor, etc. Some of the overlay zones are existing and some are new based on the recommendations of the small area plans. Locations where new doublewide manufactured homes will be allowed are shown on the overlay map as DWMH (Doublewide Manufactured Home). Approximately 19% of the County is shown in the DWMH overlay zone as compared to approximately 95% of the County currently zoned for singlewide and doublewide manufactured homes. There is no zoning district which allows new singlewide manufactured homes; although, singlewides can continue to be permitted in existing manufactured home parks and as replacements in hardship situations.

In determining how to convert the current zoning classifications into the new zoning districts the recommendations from the seven small area plans were used.

Residential property

Properties that are currently zoned residential will remain residential but the density, or minimum lot size requirement for new lots, is based on the small area plan recommendations. Existing residential lots which are less than the zoning district designation, such as a 20,000 square foot lot in a R-30 district, will be grandfathered in. Zoning permits for these nonconforming lots will be issued provided they can meet the setback requirements which are consistent with the current zoning ordinance setbacks. Approximately 50% of the area of the County is proposed to be zoned R-80, which requires approximately a 2-acre lot size for new lots based on the recommendations of the seven small area plans. The remaining 50% of the County allows for lower density ranging from R-20 (half-acre lots) to R-40 (one-acre lots). Where public water exists and the small area plan recommends higher density, lots can be reduced from R-20 to R-15 (15,000 square foot lots).

The zoning maps include 19% (or 35,367 acres) of the County's jurisdiction designated in a doublewide manufactured home overlay district (DWMH-O) where permits for new doublewide manufactured homes would be issued. The overlay district was defined by using the residential rezoning recommendations of the small area plans and scenic byway/corridor protection areas. Following are statistics on the characteristics of the doublewide manufactured home overlay district:

Vacant parcels in DWMH overlay district (grandfathered lots where new permits for doublewides can be issued):

R-20 zoning = 163 parcels consisting of 1,028 acres

R-30 zoning = 161 parcels consisting of 640 acres

R-40 zoning = 329 parcels consisting of 1,372 acres

R-80 zoning = 897 parcels consisting of 9,535 acres

Size of vacant parcels in DWMH overlay district

One acre or less: 581 parcels consisting of 337 acres

More than one acre but less than 2 acres: 195 parcels consisting of 284 acres

Two acres or more: 774 parcels consisting of 11,954 acres

Total of 1,550 vacant parcels in the DWMH overlay consisting of 12,575 acres

Based on an average of 110 new permits for doublewides over the last 5 years, this would provide a 14-year supply of lots. Taking into account the downward trend with only 36 new permits for doublewides in 2005, this could provide a greater than 40 year supply of lots.

Non-residential property

The existing non-residential zoning (commercial, office-institutional and industrial) was converted to the corresponding new non-residential zoning. Properties that were zoned C-3, which was a nonconforming commercial district, were reviewed on a case-by-case basis. If the C-3 property had an existing commercial building, whether it was actively being used or abandoned, it was zoned to Rural Commercial or Highway Commercial dependent upon their use so the property would not be nonconforming. The C-3 properties that were vacant were zoned to a residential district based on the density in the small area plans.

Flood maps

The County received new preliminary 100-year flood maps as part of the State's cooperative agreement with FEMA to produce an updated flood study for the Catawba River Basin. The new flood maps now include flood elevations for all rivers, streams and the Catawba River lakes based on new development activity which has occurred since the original flood maps were adopted in 1980 and updated topography. The County is required to notify affected property owners and allow public comment on the preliminary maps, similar to a rezoning process. Staff has included notification of the preliminary flood maps with the notice for the UDO rezoning action in order to meet this statutory requirement. The preliminary flood maps are shown as an overlay on the zoning maps but will not be adopted as part of the final zoning maps. The State has a statutory 90-day review period for public comment and appeals/protests which began August 3 and will end on November 3. The State will then reconcile any appeals and issue a final determination letter (FDL). The FDL triggers a 6-month compliance period for the County to adopt the final flood maps and amend its floodplain ordinance to include the new effective date of the maps. It is anticipated that staff will be presenting this action back to the Boards in early 2007 for this action. Individual mailed notices for this action will not be required at this time.

The Planning Board conducted a public hearing on the new official zoning maps and the preliminary flood maps at its August 7, 2006 meeting. Approximately 125 people were in attendance with eleven people speaking at the hearing. Following are the comments presented to the Board:

- concern over the limited area for doublewide manufactured homes in the overlay district and its impact on affordable housing in the County.
- concern about mixing manufactured home zoning with existing stick-built home zoning
- concern about the amount of land for doublewide overlay districts in the high density zoning because it would draw manufactured homes to those limited areas, i.e. Sigmon Dairy Road area
- question how the location of the doublewide overlay zones were determined and was there a density consideration when they were developed
- opposition to 2-acre zoning due to affordable housing issues and loss of value to property owners
- confirmation that existing lots would be grandfathered in
- opposition to the mountain protection district

The Planning Board responded to some concerns by stating that the proposals were based on six years of community planning efforts through the small area plans. Rusty Lutz noted that the UDO includes ways to address affordable housing, such as the cluster subdivision provision. Steve Von Drehle made a motion to recommend the zoning maps to the Board of Commissioners as submitted with the exception of the preliminary flood maps. The motion was seconded by Rusty Lutz and was unanimously approved by a vote of 9-0.

Chair Barnes said before she opened the public hearing she thought it was important for the audience to hear from the commissioners. She noted the proposed UDO's intent was designed to preserve and enhance the quality of the County's natural resources and environment, and also provide the basis for a healthy economy. She said it was a very comprehensive document and the Board knew that economic developers place a high value on planning and zoning ordinances since they ensure predictability. She went on to say that the impact of such a comprehensive ordinance was not truly understood by the citizens and property owners until recently. She indicated the response the Board received from citizens had highlighted some areas in the draft document that need more attention. Chair Barnes noted the majority of the document had met the community's expectations by expanding and creating options that were not available in the past, such as development standards like landscape buffers, sidewalks and density bonuses. The proposed ordinance also addressed public water and wastewater because there are areas in the County where wells have run dry and there is poor soil. Rural conservation is addressed to preserve the agricultural heritage of the County. But based on citizens' responses and the work session of August 28th, the Board will conduct additional work sessions to address manufactured housing density, minimum lot sizes and cottage businesses and other issues that may arise in these discussions. Commissioner Lail said that although the UDO process had been taking place for six years, most of the citizens have only seen it in the last two months. The Board approached it from a best case perspective but the citizens took it personally. She stated more of the citizen feedback needed to be incorporated in the ordinance. Vice-Chair Hunsucker added that the Board members were all listening to what the citizens were saying. Commissioner Barger said he could not vote in the affirmative at this time – he said anytime you pack a full house at a meeting, the issue needed to be looked at thoroughly. He said any ordinance adopted by the Board needed to promote economic development and growth and needed to promote as best as it can the rights of the citizens and he didn't think the ordinance in its present state did that. Commissioner Beatty added her appreciation for the citizens' passion regarding this ordinance. She wanted to add concerns regarding family subdivisions and commercial development off of HWY 16. Each commissioner thanked the staff and citizens who had worked hard in the development of the ordinance. All the commissioners joined with Chair Barnes in stating they were looking forward to the comments they would receive from the citizens at the public hearing and they had all done their very best to respond to every call they had received regarding the proposed ordinance. All commissioners stated they could not vote on the ordinance at this time, that additional work sessions were necessary and that a later date for adoption would be necessary. It was stressed that all Board members were listening to the citizen's comments and suggestions, and that the Board was not taking this decision lightly.

Chair Barnes then opened the public hearing and noted it was duly advertised. She stated numerous people had signed up to speak at the public hearing and asked people to try to keep their remarks to approximately 3 minutes.

Benny Leonard – 5900 Pinewinds Dr., Hickory – opposed to singlewide restrictions.

Jerry Barger – 5410 Hall Street, Conover – owns 90 acres – against mobile home restrictions and singlewide should be able to be switched out.

Louis Woods – Post Office Box 267, Catawba – opposed to ordinance because he didn't think anyone from different ethnic groups were included on the small area plan committees or on any of the steering committees.

Gerald Bennett – 4434 Grace Church Road, Newton – feels the ordinance discriminates against lower income citizens – particularly restrictions on singlewides.

Linda Rollins – 803 46th Ave Dr. NE, Hickory – President of the Catawba Valley Association of Realtors – 700+ members – believes two acre minimums will have a negative impact on land value and affordable housing.

Gene Bowman – 3362 Sigmon Dairy Road, Newton – complimented Jacky Eubanks – UDO presented to many meetings – the flexibility is in the interpretation of the plan – left to the administrators of the plan and this is about control – more government and more control.

Tom Granger – 859 Highland Ave NE, Hickory – President of Homebuilders Association. Appreciated hard work on UDO – has good points – needs some changes but homebuilders tired of being in holding partner. Against two acre minimums – will kill affordable housing.

Crystal Moretz – 4596 Macedonia Church Road, Vale – on behalf of homebased family businesses – listed occupations not included in UDO (florist; furniture builders; upholstery shops; material finishers; trim shops; auto repair shops; auto detailing shops; daycares; electricians; plumbers; welders; septic tanks; landscaping; trucking) – some may meet standards, some may not – need more than two years to come into compliance. Time should be extended to ten years to comply.

Paul Carter – 8139 Peninsula Lane, Sherrills Ford – thanked the Board for IBT resolution. Applauds Planning Board – glad the County was taking steps to plan development – it's a good thing for county – the UDO is the future of the County – concerned about watershed critical areas and environmental impact of the Village Center and Key Harbor.

John Blanton – 3456 Zion Church Road, Hickory – Ordinance hasn't considered residential area with Target deal – against the distribution center – impact on noise, water and roads.

Melissa Essick – 4911 Departure Dr., Raleigh – from NC Manufactured Housing Institute – against two acre minimums and restrictions on manufacturing housing – will have a negative effect on affordable housing.

Don Parham – 4233 Don's Point, Sherrills Ford – In favor of UDO – there are areas that need to be fixed – this is the future for the county – two acre minimum needs to be reduced – Board should stick to plan once it is in place. Manufactured homes are important – a choice that should not be removed. Another concern was road maintenance – subdivision developers need to build roads to state standards.

Leon Robinson – 1318 Brentwood Dr. Newton – commended the people who developed the UDO – still need affordable housing and two acre minimums should be reduced. Thanked Board for its effort.

Larry Little – 5590 NC HWY 16, Maiden – started out in a mobile home – against two acre minimums.

Andy Wells – Post Office Box 729, Hickory – Catawba County no longer rural – now urban - two acre minimums make sense – residential density should be based on utilities available. Septic systems dangerous to environmental health of county.

Larry Moore – 4636 Hickory Lincolnton Hwy, Newton – Opposed to two acre minimums – opposed to mobile home restrictions. Will eliminate affordable housing. Want revaluation to be fair.

Garry Teague – 2239 16th Ave NE, Hickory – (lives in Granite Falls) – concerned about two acre minimums – believes it's a serious violation of property owners rights – against two year limitation for home based businesses to come into compliance. Asked Commissioners to oppose the IBT.

Commissioner Beatty then added at this point in the public hearing that there were buses available for transport to the IBT hearing. She provided the departure location and the times of departure. Chair Barnes encouraged participation also and said she would be speaking at the meeting. Commissioner Beatty noted the attendance at the last hearing was over 700 strong – at least 150 from Catawba County – and encouraged people to attend the upcoming meeting.

Tracey Warlick – Homebuilder Association – County Staff very helpful.

Clarence Hood - Sigmon Dairy Road, Newton – member of Startown SAP – Jacky met with 50 farmers – thanked the Board for delaying the vote. Should be one acre minimum rather than two for lots without water & sewer – ½ acre where water is available and 1/3 acre when there is both water and sewer. Wise to put off vote and have more work sessions.

Stamey Nixon - 4322 Buffalo Shoals Rd., Maiden – believed no poor people on steering committees; young people need affordable housing – against two acre minimums. Policy is discriminating.

Michael Gang – 1941 Red Berry Lane, Conover – works in mortgage industry – manufactured housing days are numbered – lenders make it difficult to get funding. Need for affordable housing – against two acre minimum – one acre preferable.

W.R. Lutz - 2437 Settlemyre Bridge Road – thanked both the Planning Board and the Board of Commissioners for their efforts. Goal is economic growth. – said Catawba County was 2nd in state in unemployment.

Boyd Canipe – 1586 Rosa Propes Drive, Conover – understands needing a guideline but feels this will hurt the young people and the old people.

Chair Barnes suggested to the Commissioners that it would be beneficial to leave the public hearing open and recess it to a date certain. She suggested scheduling a minimum of three work sessions to discuss the issues raised. She stated she thought the earliest possible date for possible adoption of the ordinance would be December 18, 2006. Vice-Chair Hunsucker agreed to the three work sessions in that time period and he said he didn't know if the Board would be ready to vote in December and hated to set a specific time. Commissioner Barger clarified that the December 18th meeting would be to continue the public hearing and not necessarily to vote. Commissioner Beatty agreed with Commissioner's Barger comments and was unsure if a vote could be conducted at that time. Chair Barnes confirmed with Interim County Attorney Debra Bechtel that she had confirmed with the School of Government that it was appropriate to recess the public hearing but it had to be continued to a date certain – but that date certain did not obligate the Board to vote at that time. Vice-Chair Hunsucker made a motion to conduct the necessary work sessions with consideration to adopt and/or report on December 18, 2006. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Barnes thanked everyone for their attendance and said the Interbasin Transfer would be discussed shortly. Vice-Chair Hunsucker noted that hardship cases are addressed in the UDO and anyone in that situation should talk with Planning. There was a question how the elections affected what had been decided about recessing the public hearing and when the new board took office – Chair Barnes indicated that change would take place the first week of December.

9. Appointments:

Chair Barnes recommended the reappointment of Clyde Sigmon to a third term on the Alcohol Beverage Control Board and Bebe Leitch for a second term on the Sister Cities Association Board. Vice-Chair Hunsucker recommended the reappointment of Laura Lail Treadaway for a third term on the NC Auditorium Authority Board of Directors and Chad Franklin for a first term on the Juvenile Crime Prevention Council. Commissioner Barbara Beatty recommended the appointment of Lynn Furr, Sarah Parham and Mary Patton to the Transportation Advisory Board. These recommendations came in the form of a motion. The motion carried unanimously.

10. Other Items of Business.

a. Interbasin Transfer – Chair Barnes stated a second hearing was scheduled for 9/19/06 at Olympic High School in Charlotte. She said there had been several meetings of the Regional governments and Chamber of Commerce in regard to the actions and statements that need to be made at the 9/19 meeting and she said she would be present at this meeting in opposition to the transfer. Hickory and Conover had pledged funding for whatever is necessary moving forward and the County had been requested to participate in that effort. Chair Barnes asked the Board how they felt about this funding. Commissioner Beatty said she had been following this issue for several years and felt strongly about the County being supportive of the opposition effort and she recommended \$50,000 which was similar to Hickory's pledge. Commissioner Lail clarified that Hickory's pledge was \$50,000 a year for up to a maximum of five years. She recommended the County commit to this same amount. Commissioner Barger agreed with this recommendation and said he thought the opposition would take some persistence by municipalities and counties. Vice-Chair Hunsucker also agreed the County had a duty to support this effort. Commissioner Beatty said she thought they would know by November 1st what the Commission was going to recommend and funds would not be disbursed until then. Commissioner Beatty made the original motion, with Commissioner Lail amending it to commit \$50,000 per year for up to five years for the efforts in opposition to this transfer. The motion carried unanimously. Chair Barnes said her remarks at the meeting would focus of growth of the County's own area and its own need for this water. She would encourage withholding any decision until the Catawba area had time to digest the report that was just released which needed engineer review.

b. Assistant County Manager Lee Worsley then introduced the new Catawba County e-mail newsletter. "Catawba County E-News" will be e-mailed to subscribers twice each month beginning on September 19. A second issue is expected to be released on September 27 and it will then follow every other week thereafter. The newsletter's initial format will include brief presentations of four or five stories on different issues, which will contain links that citizens may click on to be taken directly to Catawba County's web site for more information on that story. Certain items, such as information on each agenda of the Board of Commissioners, will be featured regularly, but the newsletter will continually focus on the latest news and services provided by Catawba County Government.

c. Section II F of the 2006-2007 Budget Ordinance states: "Reinventing Departments may create or abolish positions which impact the outcomes approved by the Board of Commissioners and within available revenues

upon summary approval of the Board of Commissioners. Approval will come at the next regularly scheduled Board of Commissioners' meeting and will be attached and approved as part of the minutes."

Under this provision of the Budget Ordinance, the following personnel changes have been made to Social Services' budget:

Protective Services Social Worker (2)

The positions will provide case management services to families and children in order to maintain the family together rather than having the children removed from the home when neglect, abuse, delinquency, or other risks have caused or may cause trauma and/or family disruption. Position needed to meet state staffing standards.

Foster Care Social Worker (1)

This position will provide social work services to foster children focused on helping the child return home to his/her parents, live with kin, or placed into an adoption. The goal is to satisfy Federal and state law and move the child to a permanent living arrangement with legal time frames. Also, the position is needed to satisfy state staffing standards.

Child Welfare Program Manager (1)

The ever increasing complex area of child welfare along with the increasing of child abuse/neglect cases as well as a rapidly increasing foster care population require additional leadership.

11. Attorneys' Report.

Attorney Anne Marie Pease presented a request for the Board to adopt two resolutions to complete the contractual obligations of incentives contracts entered into by the County and Flowers Food Corporation and Bakers Furniture. The Board of Commissioners took action on the Flowers Foods incentive contract in October 2005 and on the Baker/Kohler incentive contract in July 2006. These documents have now been executed by Flowers Food and Baker/Kohler and the following resolutions are required to be adopted to complete the contractual requirements prior to Chair Barnes signing the contracts. Commissioner Lail made a motion to adopt these resolutions and the motion carried unanimously.

Resolution No. 2006-

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR FLOWER FOODS CORPORATION

WHEREAS, Flower Foods Corporation requested incentives for investment totals in excess of \$40,000,000 to acquire, improve and expand the former Harvest States Facility in Newton's Danner Industrial Park and to locate a minimum of 158 persons for the production and distribution of bakery products. The construction, acquisition and/or installation of the improvements will result in the creation of a minimum of 158 new net jobs prior to December 31, 2007 in Catawba County and 82 of such jobs will pay wages that are above the median average wage in the County for all insured industries as computed by the Employment Security Commission for the most recent period for which data is available.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of Catawba County, North Carolina, as follows:

Flowers Food Corporation shall make substantial improvements to the Harvest States Facility in Newton's Danner Industrial Park during Calendar Years One (1) through (5) (Calendar Year One means calendar year 2006 and Calendar Year Two through Five mean the succeeding four calendar years) and the total cumulative expenditures will meet or exceed Thirteen Million Dollars (\$13,000,000) in Calendar Year One, Twenty Three Million, Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$23,500,000) in Calendar Year Two and will meet or exceed Forty Million, Eight Hundred Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$40,830,000) in Calendar Years Three through Five. Flowers Food Corporation agrees to maintain in place said improvements for a period of not less than three (3) years following expiration of Calendar Year Five.

Based on these investments and the creation of a minimum of 158 new net jobs prior to December 31, 2007 in Catawba County, 82 of such jobs paying wages above the median average wage for all insured industries in Catawba County, the Board of Commissioners approves an economic grant not to exceed Two Hundred Sixty Eight Thousand Dollars (\$268,000). Said amount will be payable in five (5) annual installments, beginning in Calendar Year One and payable through Calendar Year Five. Upon payment of ad valorem taxes by Flowers Food Corporation to the County in Calendar Year One through Five, and upon certification of the required improvements to the Harvest States Facility, the County will pay to Flowers Food Corporation an economic development incentive payment equal to 50% of the total ad valorem tax revenue received by the County attributable to the value of the improvements made by Flowers Food Corporation. This economic grant, not to exceed \$268,000, will be paid to Flowers Food Corporation in installments over five years and used to reimburse Flowers Foods Corporation expenditures as eligible under North Carolina General Statute 158-7.1(a). The Board also directs the Chair to execute a contract between Flowers Food Corporation and the County under these terms and conditions.

This the day of September, 2006.

Resolution No. 2006-

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR BAKER KNAPP & TUBBS, INC. (BAKER FURNITURE)

WHEREAS, Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc., a division of Kohler Interior Group and subsidiary of Kohler Co., requested incentives for investment totals in the amount of \$5,628,000 to locate Baker Furniture's corporate headquarters and distribution facility in the former Corning Specialty Cable Plant off of McDonald Parkway. Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. will make substantial improvements to the real property and install personal property during the improvement period, June 1, 2006 to December 21, 2007 and will create a minimum of 76 positions prior to December 31, 2007 in Catawba County. Such jobs will pay wages that are above the median average wage in Catawba County for all insured industries as computed by the Employment Security Commission for the most recent period for which data is available.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of Catawba County, North Carolina, as follows:

Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. shall make substantial improvements to the former Corning Specialty Cable Plant off of McDonald Parkway during June 1, 2006 and December 21, 2007 (improvement period) and the total expenditures will meet or exceed five million six hundred twenty-eight thousand dollars (\$5,628,000) during the improvement period. Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. agrees to maintain in place said improvements for a period of not less than three (3) years following expiration of Calendar Year Five.

Based on these investments and the creation of a minimum of 76 new net jobs prior to December 31, 2007 in Catawba County, such jobs paying wages above the median average wage for all insured industries in Catawba County, the Board of Commissioners approves an economic grant not to exceed fifty five thousand four hundred thirty dollars (\$55,430). Said amount will be payable in five (5) annual installments, beginning in Calendar Year One and payable through Calendar Year Five. Calendar Year One means calendar year 2008 and Calendar Year Two through Five mean the succeeding four (4) calendar years. Upon payment of ad valorem taxes by Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. to the County in Calendar Year One through Five, and upon certification of the required improvements to the former Corning Specialty Cable Plant off of McDonald Parkway, the County will pay to Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. an economic development incentive payment equal to 67% of the total ad valorem tax revenue received by the County attributable to the value of the improvements made by Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. for Calendar Years One through Three. This economic grant, not to exceed \$55,430, will be paid to Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. in installments over five years and used to reimburse Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. expenditures as eligible under North Carolina General Statute 158-7.1(a). In order to spread the payments over Calendar Year One through Calendar Year Five, the payment amount will equal 40.2% of the total net real and personal property taxes received by the County attributable to the value of the improvements made by Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. for each of the five years of the installment payments. The Board also directs the Chair to execute a contract between Baker Knapp & Tubbs, Inc. and the County under these terms and conditions.

This the day of September, 2006.

12. Manager's Report. None.
13. Adjournment. Chair Barnes adjourned the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Katherine W. Barnes, Chair
Board of Commissioners

Barbara E. Morris, County Clerk